[2nd March 1929

(b) whether the authorities of the Revenue and Public Works (Irrigation) Departments enquired into the matter and found that the complaints were based on facts;

(c) whether the authorities recommended that all the sluices in the channel above the tank should have screw doors and wanted the owners of the lands below the tank to contribute the whole cost;

(d) whether the cost so required has been fully paid up and, if so, when and how much;

(e) whether the doors have not yet been put up and, if so, why; and

(f) when the Government intend to put up the doors and what compensation the Government propose to pay to the land-owners for the delay and for the money remaining with the Government all the time?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government understand that the local officers received such a complaint and enquired into the matter, but the Government have no information as to the actual facts.

(c) Yes.

(d) A sum of Rs. 760 is reported to have been paid by the ryots in March 1927.

(e) On account of a change in the personnel of the section and the Subdivisional officers just at the time of the closure of the channel, it is reported that the work could not be put in hand at once.

(f) The Executive Engineer reports that the work has since been put in hand. As regards the latter part of this clause Government do not admit any liability. So far as Government is aware no claim has been made on this ground.

Landlord and Tenant

Dismissal of suits under the Estates Land Act by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Chatrapur.

* 1637 Q.—Mr. D. Narayana Raju: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the number of suits and petitions under the Estates Land Act of 1908 decreed ex parte or dismissed for default by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Chatrapur, Ganjam district, within the six months ending with November 1928;

(b) whether there were any complaints against the said officer that he is abusing parties especially the zamindari ryots;

(c) whether there was any resolution of the Berhampur Bar bearing on the said officer's discourtesy to its members; and

(d) the action taken on these representations?

A.—(a) Two hundred and eighty-two suits were decreed ex parte. Eleven suits and 13 petitions were dismissed for default of appearance of the plaintiff and the petitioner.

(b) A petition was received by the Board of Revenue containing such allegations but no action was taken as the petition was unsigned.

(c) & (d) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to clause (d) of question No. 1466.

2nd March 1929]

Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU :—" May I know whether the dismissal of petitions is somewhat unusual in this court or is it a normal practice ? "

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" I could not say. I presume that it is the usual course to decree ex parte when the parties are not present when their cases are called."

Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU :—" May I know whether the dismissal of so many suits has taken place only after the advent of the present Revenue Divisional Officer, and what was the number dismissed by the previous Divisional Officer ? "

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" That will be a matter for examination and I must ask for notice."

Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU :—" With reference to the answers (c) and (d), considering that the relations between the present officer and the bar are strained—I am referring to the answer to question No. 1466—may I know whether the Government would be pleased to consider the desirability of transferring this particular gentleman from that place ? " 11-15 a.m.

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" I am afraid that Government cannot undertake to transfer any officer on allegations reported to have been baseless."

Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU :—" May I know whether the Government have taken any pains to ascertain whether the allegations made by the members of the bar—I am referring to the answer given to question No. 1466—are true or not ? "

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" Yes, Sir; I recollect that the answer stated that report had been obtained from the Collector."

Public Holidays

Holiday to Muhammadans for 'Arfa.'

*1638 Q.—Mr. MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether a Government Order was issued removing from the list of sectional holidays for Muhammadans, the 9th day of the month of Zulhajj which is the day preceding the Bakrid festival, usually known as 'Arfa';

(b) whether the Government are aware that 'Arfa' is a very important holiday in which all Muhammadans have to fast and that unlike Gyarween Shareef which is also an important holiday, it is observed by all sections of Muslims;

(c) whether the Muslim public consulted by Government have agreed to the substitution of Gyarween Shareef on the 11th day of Rabi-us Sani for the said sectional holiday for Bakrid;

(d) if so, who the Muhammadans are who have been consulted ; and

(e) whether the Government will be pleased to include 'Arfa' also among the sectional holidays for Muhammadans in view of its great importance ?